Vol. V., No. 9. DECEMBER, 1915.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of TRUTH, FREEDOM, and PROGRESS in the Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus.*

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke.*

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A.

CONTENTS.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—
Clergymen as Combatants.
The Neutral Vicar of Christ.
A Time for Theological Stock-taking.
Practical Steps towards Re-union.
The Threefold Mission of English Churchmen.
False Rationalism and True.

HOW TO PRESERVE THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY.—By Rev. Prebendary PARSONS, M.A.

THE LAITY AND THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.
By W. B. GORDON.

THE FEAST AND THOSE WHO ARE BIDDEN.
By Rev. F. D. CREMER, M.A.

THE REPRESENTATION OF CHURCHWOMEN.
By Miss K. M. EMERY.

THE PROMISE OF HIS COMING.—By Rev. J. F. MOORE, M.A.

REVIEWS.—The Church and the New Knowledge.
The Ephesian Gospel.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS

CORRESPONDENCE.—United Communion.
The Quaker Position.
The One Volume Bible Commentary.

Library of the PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY Berkeley, California

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.

London Agents:—WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, W.C.
ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price 6d. net. Annual Subscription, 5/- (including postage).

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

The Right Hon. LORD GREY, G.C.M.G., G.C.B., 22, South St., Park Lane W.
Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
PHILIP H. BAGENAL, Esq., Harrogate.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, 29, Egerton Gardens, Hendon, N.W.
The Rev. Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
The Rev. W. MANNING, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, Acrise, Hall Place Gardens, St. Albans.
The Rev. Canon H. RASHDALL, Litt.D., F.B.A., New College, Oxford.
Sir E. RUSSELL, 5, Croxteth Road, Liverpool.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq., 1, Wellington Street, Strand, London, W.C.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Rev. Dr. DUKENFIELD ASTLEY.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
Rev. Canon BANNISTER.
Rev. A. N. BAX.
Rev. J. H. C. B. de CANDOLE.
Prof. M. A. CANNEY.
Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
Rev. Canon CREMER.
Prof. CRUICKSHANK.
Rev. H. DALE.
Rev. Canon W. DANKS.
Rev. J. A. DODD.
Rev. W. A. EDWARDS.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.
Rev. Canon FOAKES-JACKSON.
Rev. JOHN GAMBLE.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. H. HANDLEY.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES.
Rev. H. LAURENCE.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.
Rev. R. G. MILBURN.
Rev. J. LLOYD MILNE.
Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
Rev. CAVENDISH MOXON.
Very Rev. ARNOLD PAGE.
Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
Rev. Canon RASHDALL.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE.
Rev. T. F. ROYDS.
Rev. C. J. SHARP.
Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
Rev. A. H. STANWAY.
Sir RICHARD STAPLEY.
Rev. J. E. SYMES.
Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
Rev. Dr. R B. TOLLINTON.
Prof. A. G. WIDGERY.
Rev. J. R. WILKINSON.
Rev. FERGUS WOOD.
Miss YOUNGHUSBAND.

Hon. Treasurer:—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.
Hon. Auditor.—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.
Hon. Secretary.—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire.
Hon. Assistant Secretaries.—Miss. D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES, Llanfoist, Clifton Downs, Bristol.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices in the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ.
5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

Annual Subscription:—Members at least 5/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. C. Moxon,** Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

***The Modern Churchman*, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent *free* to all full members of the Union, and to non-members at a charge of 5/- per annum.**

Editor:—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, to whom all literary contributions are to be sent.

Business Manager:—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

PAGE.

Signs of the Times:—
Clergymen as Combatants 441
The Neutral Vicar of Christ 442
A Time for Theological Stock-taking... 443
Practical Steps towards Re-union 445
The Threefold Mission of English Churchmen 447
False Rationalism and True 449
How to Preserve the National Church 450
The Training of the Clergy 454
The Laity and the Councils of the Church 464
The Feast and those who are bidden 470
The Representation of Churchwomen 476
The Promise of His Coming 483
Reviews—The Church and the New Knowledge 489
The Ephesian Gospel 490
Churchmen's Union News 492
Correspondence—United Communion 494
The Quaker Position... 495
The One Volume Bible Commentary 496

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1915. Vol. V.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Clergymen as Combatants.

With the heavy demands for more recruits, the question of the enlistment of the clergy who are physically fit has reached an acute stage. When war broke out, and the Government called for volunteers, we urged that the clergy should be left free to act according to their consciences in the matter of enlistment, and pointed out that for many of our younger clergy a course in the trenches might be regarded as a valuable form of post-graduate or post-ordination training.* However, our ecclesiastical authorities declined to allow the clergy freedom in the matter, and made it clear to them that their specifically religious duties required them to remain in their parishes unless called upon to act as naval and military chaplains, or to serve in connection with ambulance work.

There is no doubt that the episcopal decision can be supported by excellent arguments and telling precedents, and was dictated by the very highest motives. It had, moreover, the assent, if not the actual approval, of eminent laymen. Unfortunately, the man in the street, to judge by many of the letters and paragraphs which are appearing in the press, takes a very different view of the matter. He seems to think an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory; that to preach patriotism effectively one must practice it; that to call this a holy war, and then not to don khaki is inconsistent; that there is no moral difference between taking up arms oneself, and calling on others to do so; that the young clergyman has missed a splendid chance of proving the sincerity and manliness of his profession; that a Church whose Founder shed His blood in the cause of

* *Modern Churchman*, Vol. iv., No. 11.

righteousness ought not to withhold from her officers the right to do the same.

It is hard to estimate the effect which a different episcopal policy would have produced. Many of our clergy are deploring to-day that, notwithstanding the national sufferings, bereavements, and dangers, there is no real turning to the Church on the part of the nation, although there may be an increasing earnestness in the national life. We cannot but feel that the policy of the Church in this matter of clerical enlistment is partly the cause of it.

Days of humiliation and intercession, clerical retreats, public litanies, pulpit eloquence, pale in influence beside calm, courage, and cheerfulness shewn in the presence of suffering and death by those who are not mere spectators but sharers in them.

The Neutral Vicar of Christ.

A scathing criticism of Papal opportunism appears in Alfred Loisy's recent *brochure, The War and Religion.**

In his pamphlet M. Loisy especially attacks the Papal attitude of *neutrality*. Neutrality where moral questions are involved is an impossible attitude for a moral authority. In other words, it is an immoral attitude. For a moral authority to stand by and observe immoral conduct and to offer no condemnation of it, is to abnegate his position. Yet this has been the attitude of Benedict XV. He has confused *neutrality* with *impartiality*. Every moral authority should be *impartial*, but he cannot be *neutral* in the presence of wickedness. With French precision M. Loisy states the case:—

> "By impartiality is understood that perfect justice which ought to be followed in the treatment of persons and the estimate of things. Neutrality has nothing moral in it, has no common link with justice; implies a wholly passive attitude with regard to other people's quarrels, considering neither the facts nor the reasons which may influence the opposing parties. Impartiality is a duty and a virtue; neutrality is only a matter of common prudence, one might even say of policy. Whoever

**The War and Religion*, by Alfred Loisy, translated by A. Galton. Pub. Blackwell, Oxford. Price 1/6 net

pretends to be neutral in matters where justice is concerned, fails to be impartial. As a matter of fact, whoever, in such a matter, claims to be indifferent is in reality siding with him who is in the wrong and against him who is in the right. . . .

"So when the Pope talks of the inconveniences which might result from any action upon his part, that is, from a judgment dictated by the claims of impartial justice, he does not consider the matter from the standpoint of truth or right, but merely of political opportunism, and that is precisely the standpoint of neutrality."

This is a tragic position for the infallible Vicar of Christ. Yet the Pope is not so neutral that he cannot find strong words of condemnation for wrong-doers when it is safe to utter them. Last month, on the occasion of his sixty-first birthday, he made a speech to the Society of the Defence of the Faith, in which he dealt very faithfully with the Protestant propaganda in Rome:—

"What do these emissaries of Satan, who, in the midst of the Holy City, raise temples where God is denied true worship—who erect pestilential cathedrals to spread errors among the people; who scatter, with liberal hand, falsehood and calumny against the Catholic religion and its ministers? These devilish arts are so many assaults against the faith of the sons of Rome."

We do not know how far Protestant propagandist methods deserve this diatribe, but it is a pity that one who can command such force of language should allow the German atrocities in Belgium and elsewhere to go uncondemned.

A Time for Theological stock-taking.

The last number of the *Hibbert Journal* points to the decline, since the outbreak of the war, in the number of theological publications. What had formerly been a torrent has since become a mere trickle. This is equally true in other classes of literature. Only war-books attract and those which can connect themselves with the new interests which the war has created.

This decline in theological publications does not necessarily indicate that there is any decline in religion, for the books of of the theologians, with rare exceptions, are read by the theologians and the theologians alone, and the reviews of their

volumes are read by a certain limited number of the general public. So it is only the theologians who are really affected by the decline in the out-put of theological literature, and to some of them it must come in the form of a relief. The words: "The night cometh when no man can work," do not by any means always fall on unwelcome ears. Theological research and theological speculation have produced during recent years more material than most students, except the very best equipped, have been able to keep abreast of. The most strenuous in the pursuit of theological knowledge will now be none the worse for doing a little stock-taking. Criticism, textual, higher, and historical, appear to have done nearly everything that is possible in connection with the Old and New Testaments and the history of Church dogmas and institutions.

Research is done with for the present. What is needed is the practical presentation and application of results. The plain man is for ever coming to the door of the learned and saying, as did the shameless one to Shammai: "Teach me the whole law while I stand here on one leg." And the servants of the learned realising how much their master has got into his head and the very little power he has of getting it out in plain practical form, drive the shameless one away. Until at last the shameless one presents himself at the the door of a Hillel—no less learned but more practical than Shammai—and putting the same request receives from his lips the masterly summary: "That which is hateful to thyself, do not to another. This is the whole law. All the rest is but commentary."

The task that lies before our theologians to-day, is to transmute the results of recent research into practical religious and moral and social values. Research, it is an open secret, has been drastically changing the values of various theological and ecclesiastical dogmas, some it has raised, others it has depressed, but while many students vaguely recognise this process, few have dared to cast up their accounts in the light of it, and fewer still have had the supreme courage to publish

their accounts. The modern man would very much like to see those accounts duly audited with the securities written down from their face to their market value. Now is the time for theologians to accomplish this difficult and dangerous operation. It would help to restore public confidence and might perhaps encourage investment. A firm which honestly writes down its securities inspires greater confidence than one which is suspected of over-valuing them in order to present an encouraging balance sheet.

Practical Steps towards Re-union.

We are not always able to see eye to eye with "Artifex," the well-known contributor on current Church topics to the *Manchester Guardian*. When we are able to do so, it is a pleasure, for he represents a type of religious and thoughtful Anglo-Catholicism with which we feel no little sympathy. Commenting recently on Canon Bannister's paper, published in the last *Modern Churchman*, "Artifex" writes, and every liberal Churchman will agree with him:—

> "What we want is a great deal more social intercourse between Churchpeople and Nonconformists, especially between clergy and ministers, and a great deal more active and cordial co-operation in philanthropic and social work. Here there can be no principles at stake, and yet great good will result from increased mutual understanding and sympathy. Many young Anglicans and Nonconformists owe much to the better understanding of one another's position which they have gained by co-operating at university settlements and similar places.
>
> "But this is not enough even for the present, and certainly not enough to be content with for the future. And the question is what could and should be desired at once. I say again, as I have said before, that I should like to see the Church of England declare plainly that Nonconformists, being full members of their own religious denominations, would we welcome as guests at our altars without confirmation. When I made this suggestion in this column some time ago a correspondent wrote somewhat angrily declaring that my suggestion was an insult to Nonconformists, who had sacraments of their own and did not need or desire any such action on the part of the Church of England. But was my correspondent right? I think not. In South Africa, in hospital, and in small country villages where there were Nonconformists without a resident minister I have often met with men and women who, without wishing for a moment to join the Church of England, would

gladly and gratefully have welcomed admission to the Holy Communion at the Anglican service. And if there were none such, then no harm would be done by the offer.

"Nor can it be asserted that there is anything, except a rubric which the Church made and which the Church could unmake, which need prevent such action. And I should like to see interchange of pulpits allowed. The Church does not restrict the liberty of prophesying among her own members to those who have received episcopal ordination. And so here, too, there is no root-principle at stake. I am always opposed to any action which, in the name of broad-mindedness, asks either side to behave as if what they believed was not true. I do not intend to surrender what I hope to be true, and I do not wish to ask anyone else to do so either. But I do feel that there is a strong obligation on everyone to ask himself what he can surrender, for the sake of charity and unity, which will not touch vital truth.

"What would the Church of England surrender by such action as I have suggested? She would surrender the position of one who regards the Nonconformists as people who are morally blameworthy, and with whom no terms must be made. She would surrender the position of those who say, 'If they want to worship with us let them own themselves wrong and return to the communion of the Church.' Will the Church of England officially surrender this position? Does she feel willing to do so?

Is it not possible to feel that the surrender has already been made in principle as the result of the Kikuyu utterances of the Primate and the Pan-Anglican Consultative Body, and that what is needed now is to prepare Church people for its practice? It is apparently the case that interchange of pulpits with Nonconformists is illegal, but that need offer no insuperable difficulty. Our bishops constantly permit, even if they do not actually sanction, illegalities where they believe them to be for the benefit of the Church. A good example of this is furnished by Dr. Gore's recent permission in regard to Reservation of the Sacrament for communicating the sick in his diocese, an ancient practice but one definitely forbidden in the Prayer Book. So also with the recent decisions of the Bishop of Carlisle in the Kirkby Lonsdale case, they cannot claim to be strictly legal, yet they are such as will commend themselves to all Churchmen who rightly desire to see a *modus vivendi* arranged between parishioners holding different liturgical ideals. Where the episcopal sanction of any practice can be shewn to be profitable and popular, however illegal it

may be, there is not the slightest prospect of adverse action by the Crown. Acts of Parliament legalising such practices are only needed for the relief of episcopal tender consciences, and it is impossible, when we remember the number of illegalities which are practised in every diocese with the knowledge of the bishops, to feel that the fact that interchange of pulpits with Nonconformists is illegal need be any ground for an episcopal veto of the practice. At the same time, without episcopal consent it becomes practically impossible, the law being what it is, to introduce the practice. If Parliament be not approached to alter the law, and that at present is out of the question, the alternative is to form an association to bring about this practice, which, if tactfully introduced with episcopal assent, might certainly do much to bring Churchmen and Nonconformists closer together.

The Threefold Mission of English Churchmen.

"Champions of Freedom, Servants of Truth, Lovers of Reality," are proud titles, yet under them Dr. A. W. Robinson* has recently set forth the ideal vocation of English Churchmen. Freedom, he says, is the note of English nationality :—

> "Through and through the British fibre runs the unconquerable determination to be free. We claim with right that our land is the home of free Institutions. Individuals are free. We have a free Parliament and a free Press. We are the heart and fibre of a free Empire."

Dr. Robinson sees the same note in the English Church. Her history has been, at least, in one of its aspects, a great fight for freedom, and the most serious menace to her freedom in the past, as in the present, is the spirit of Romanism, which is the spirit of ecclesiastical tyranny. To accept that rule means "the acceptance of conditions that make freedom and progress impossible."

> "In the prayer which we offer upon our knees in our Convocations every day that they meet, we use the words: *Tyrannidem papalem merito et serio repudiavimus*, and we mean what we say."

* In his lecture at St. Martin's in the Fields, published in full in the *Guardian* of Nov 18th.

The recent secession to Rome of a number of Zanzibarite clergymen, and the increasing vigour of the Roman propaganda within the Church among the younger clergy, render it needful to assert even to-day that the Church of England will no more yield to Papal aggression than the English Empire will yield to the German *Welt-politik*.

Truth is "the second obligation of our English vocation." Here Dr. Robinson seems to feel that our loyalty may suffer a greater strain than in our adhesion to freedom.

> "I could hope that our hearts will as clearly endorse the proposition that it is the vocation of the Church of England to range itself on the side of truth, prepared to follow wherever this may lead."

He recognises, as only the student can, the tremendous difficulty of the present situation.

It is easy to talk of acceptlng the truth and proclaiming the truth, but how to reconcile new truth with old, and how to teach the new truth so as to strengthen the moral and spiritual life of the nation is a practical problem of immense difficulty.

> "The last hundred years have brought us a bewildering inrush of fresh knowledge, scientific, historical, social, and economic. The trial to religious belief has been severe, almost to the breaking point."

Yet Dr. Robinson finds the past 300 years full of encouragement. The Church of England has stood for sound learning. "It has produced an unfailing succession of wise thinkers and teachers." It is here that we have to face the most serious danger. The past is no sure index to the present. The intelligent study of Biblical theology by laymen and women is most encouraging. The granting of the Archbishop's diploma to women for theological proficiency has served a most useful purpose. We anticipate remarkable results when educated women study more generally, on modern lines, the many-sided problems of religion. But the serious question for the Church at the present moment is not the education of her laity; it is the education of her clergy. Dr. Robinson seems to us to be too optimistic here. Before another generation is gone the claim of the clergy to be a learned body of competent teachers will be an absurdity unless great reforms are effected in the education of the clergy.

The third obligation of the English Churchman is to love reality. This will shew itself in naturalness, simplicity, and sterling honesty. Here Dr. Robinson asks serious questions:—

> "Why have Church attendances in so many cases diminished? Why have so many of our more vigorous minds slipped away from our services? Is it not because to many of them attendances and services have ceased to seem real?"

Dr. Robinson's lecture, as the late Bishop John Wordsworth would have said, is possessed of "the spirit of foundation." We hope that it will have in the metropolis the influence which it deserves.

False Rationalism and True.

Dr. A. W. Robinson, in the lecture to which we have just referred, quotes the late Monsignor Hugh Benson as saying:—

> "The misery of being an Anglican is that it is all so rational, you have to make up your mind on every conceivable point. Why not make it up on one point—the authority of the Church—and have done with it?"

This description may be true of a scholastic Anglicanism which is passing away, but it is only a parody of modern Anglicanism. Modern Anglicanism, and that is why it is customary to call it vague, does not hesitate to affirm with the blessed Apostle St. Paul that "now we see through a glass darkly." The modern Anglican teacher does not demand that English Churchmen should make up their minds on many of the mysteries of life. Just the opposite. His advice is rather this—

> "Make up your mind on the great fundamentals of the religious life which are very few. As for the speculative problems by which you are surrounded, you can afford to neglect them except where they involve practical questions. We are not saved by assent to propositions. In practical matters be decided; in speculative questions keep an open mind. If you wish for a solution, do not fear to investigate, but be sure of your principles, be true to the best methods, and do not hasten to decide. Remember that we live by working hypotheses. If correct they bring their own verification to those who live by them. You may find, however, that they will from time to time require modification demanded by fresh experience."

This we believe to be the modern Anglican attitude. It certainly was the attitude of Bishop Lightfoot, who declared

that he felt no necessity to have everything made "right and tight," but only required for practical purposes to feel sure in regard to certain central positions. Even Archbishop Usher more than 300 years ago said of the XXXIX. Articles:—

> "Neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ and His Apostles; but in a mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to *believe* them, but only not to *contradict* them."*

Father Benson's conception of the rationalism of Anglicanism is not the product of the best Anglican traditions. The best Anglicans have stood for the supremacy of reason, which they declared is the candle of the Lord within us, but they have never declared either the duty, or the necessity, or the ability of reason to decide conclusively in regard to the thousand and one speculative problems which surround existence. The rationalism which Father Benson mistook for Anglicanism seems to us to be a product of ignorance and arrogance, and nearly related to mediaeval scholasticism. It may be true of the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, but it is not true of that of Bishop Butler.

HOW TO PRESERVE THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

Our twentieth century Laud is always worth reading, and his recent article: "Is the Church of England worth preserving?"† has attracted wide attention, both on account of its eminent author and the pleasantly alarming character of its title.

The Bishop of Oxford happily comes to the conclusion that the Church of England is worth preserving. Had Dr. Gore turned down his thumb, it would have gone hard with the National Church, for at the present moment he is the practical arbiter of her destiny. His verdict is that she deserves to live,

* Tulloch's *Rational Theology*, vol. II., p. 41.

† Published in the November number of the *Oxford Diocesan Gazette*.

not for what she is, but because of her vocation, which he sets forth in the following admirable definition:—

> "The vocation of the Anglican Church . . . is to maintain, on the basis of the Catholic creed and system, the largeness, the comprehensiveness of the Catholic Church; it is to seek to show how much of what is now separated in many sects or divided portions of Christendom is capable of being held together on the Catholic basis."

This is, indeed, the voice of Jacob, the Anglo-Catholic Liberal who edited *Lux Mundi*. The hairy hands of Esau, the ardent hunter of Modernists, are concealed from view. In the *Record*, Dean Wace, whom we may liken to the aged Isaac, blesses the Bishop for these goodly words, and we, although not exalted enough to bless, yet utter a fervent *Amen* as they fall on our sympathetic ears.

But how is the Church of England to achieve her vocation and so accomplish her preservation? The Bishop's answer is quite simple:—

> "It must recover, speedily and not merely in some remote future, the power which it ought never to have suffered itself to lose, the power of binding or loosing, with which Christ endowed His Church."

By this the Bishop means that the Church must obtain greater powers of legislative and disciplinary action than she has at present. In other words, the Bishop demands Disestablishment as the means, or, at least, the necessary preliminary to the Church realising her vocation. Moreover, he makes it equally clear how this legislative and disciplinary power, which Disestablishment is to confer, will be used. It will be used to unify the Church. In other words, it will first be used to exclude from the Church certain "Rationalist or Romanising or merely Protestant parties" which at present exist in, rather than share the life of, the Church.

"It is true," remarks the Bishop, that "they are very small numerically considered, but they are very vigorous, and active, and determined." That settles their fate. As things are constituted at present they are sheltered from ecclesiastical discipline by the Establishment, but the hairy hands of Esau, now in fetters stamped with the broad arrow of the State, are itching to grasp them. Were Disestablishment to strike off the fetters from those hairy hands, short would be the shrift of

the modern Fishers, Baxters, Chillingworths, and Haleses, which the twentieth century Church of England suffers rather than comprehends.

Bishop Gore is quite convinced, as convinced as in his day was the martyred Laud, that he advocates a policy which can preserve the Church of England and make her really Catholic. *O sancta simplicitas!* The only effect of Dr. Gore's policy would be to turn the Church of England into a sect. This would be achieved by first eliminating the extreme Romanist and Rationalist elements. The remainder would then split up into two bodies of unequal size. The smaller body consisting of Evangelicals would soon join a body of re-united Protestant Dissenters. The remaining body dispossessed of its prestige and many of its endowments, vainly striving to hold is own against Romanism, Secularism, and Evangelical Protestantism, would rapidly cease to exert a national influence, and in a few generations would come to occupy in England the relatively unimportant position which is at present occupied by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Neither Liberal Churchmen nor Evangelical Churchmen will consent to Bishop Gore's policy for making an intolerant Anglo-Catholicism supreme in an attenuated Church of England. Neither Liberals nor Evangelicals invited by the attractive and insidious pleas of freedom, comprehensiveness, and lay representation will consent to a policy which would prove in practice one of narrow exclusiveness and ecclesiastical tyranny. The Establishment is for the Liberal the guardian of ecclesiastical freedom and real comprehensiveness. The Establishment is for the Evangelical the guardian of the Church's Reformed Faith and worship. Neither Liberal nor Evangelical will consent to exchange these solid advantages for the *donum exitiale* or *ignis fatuus* which Bishop Gore insists on their receiving, and with the eager assistance of Secularists, Romanists, and Protestant Dissenters, should have little difficulty in bestowing.

The Liberal is no more appreciative of Romanism in the Church of England than is Bishop Gore, but he does not

believe in burning down a house to roast a sucking pig, especially if he suspects that after all it is not the Romanist sucking pig which will be roasted.

The Church of England authorities have quite sufficient power in their hands at present to enable them to deal effectively with cases of absolute disloyalty. If they do not choose to use the power they have, and adopt proper disciplinary measures, that is no reason for giving them greater disciplinary power which they may equally decline to use against Romanists, but be ready enough to use against Liberals.

What the Church of England needs to preserve her is not to take the unestablished Church of South Africa for her model —a model which as Professor Headlam recently pointed out has nothing very attractive about it—and to seek for legislative and disciplinary powers which in her present condition she is only too likely to use to her own hurt. Her need is very different. She needs a vastly larger measure of the Spirit of Christ—a spirit of love, truth, freedom, and service. If the Bishops and clergy were really possessed of that "Spirit-guided mind" for the free operation of which Dr. Gore desires Disestablishment, they would quickly find that the Establishment is no bar to extending influence and mounting spiritual power. That "Spirit-guided mind" would quickly win over cold Rationalists and hard Protestants and disloyal Romanists, or nullify their baneful influence, and so free Bishop Gore from the painful necessity of getting them by the throat and flinging them over the battlements of Zion. What we need is not to trust in the arm of flesh, but in the Spirit of Christ. Let loyal Churchmen strive to accomplish the preservation of the Church of England by prayer, by example, by persuasion, by sound education, by love unfeigned, by self-sacrificing service. That policy will accomplish for the Church of England what a crude policy of Disestablishment and party-legislation cannot achieve. By this means will the Church which Bishop Gore loves, and which he has served so devotedly, be preserved as the great spiritual home of the English race.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY.

By the Rev. Prebendary Parsons, M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College.

The very important and urgent question of Reform in the Training of the Clergy is very closely connected with the still more fundamental question of the nature of the Christian Ministry, and its proper function in the Church, and this in its turn depends on our conception of the character and purpose of the Church itself. It is the peculiar distinction, perhaps the peculiar glory, of the Church of England that it contains within its communion schools of thought representing very widely divergent points of view concerning the Church and the Ministry, and though this divergence of faith, and consequently of practice, on so important a matter may militate against our capacity to present an undivided front to the hostile forces arrayed against Christianity, and is for that reason to be deplored, in the long run it should undoubtedly make for greater ecclesiastical efficiency; for if and when the Church of England makes up its mind to agree to any one conception of the Church and its Ministry, then we may be sure that this agreement will have been the outcome not of any forced and artificial dragooning of faith, but the reasoned and deliberate result of full, free, and fair argument, criticism, scholarship, and practical experiment, towards which each of the different types of ecclesiastical theory will have contributed what is best in their own peculiar traditions, through a process which gradually eliminates error, and insures the survival of the truest.

It is because I am a believer in this method of arriving at truth, and ultimately because I believe that truth is a living and a growing power, not an inert and changeless lump of matter, that I can continue in the communion of a Church which contains among its members many whose opinions concerning the faith are so very different from my own that

I cannot help feeling that if I am right they must be very seriously wrong. This readiness on the part of Anglicans to agree to differ strikes outsiders as feeble and illogical; but I believe it is really at bottom most logical, and a source of strength; and in any case I see in it and respect the peculiar ethos of our Church, out of the generous development of which I believe it is destined in God's good time to make a valuable contribution to the treasury of Christendom.

This introduction may serve to explain my point of view, and to justify the first point which I would make, and that is this, that in reforming and developing our method of training the clergy we do not want to aim at any rigid uniformity. There is only one thing we have got to aim at, and that is greater clerical efficiency, and as our conceptions of clerical efficiency differ very widely according to our conceptions of the clerical office, it is the duty of those responsible to see to it that the different schools of thought and the different methods they naturally employ in aiming at their different ideals, have all alike the opportunity of becoming increasingly efficient in a fair field with no favour. It is perhaps open to question whether this is the case at present, but the general conditions are improving, and the growing intercourse among representatives of different points of view, and their consequent greater sympathy and readiness to learn from each other, will no doubt help to secure what we need, *i.e.*, equality of opportunity and equality of efficiency for those different types and methods of training for the ministry which are at present all of them holding their own, though sometimes with undue difficulty, within the limits of the English Church. But do not misunderstand me. I am not so pessimistic as to hold that throughout the whole length of its future history the Church of England will be perpetually composed of three distinct ecclesiastical parties—High, Low, and Broad,—each trying to get the better of the others and put an end to their existence. I look forward to a time, and it may not be so far off as some would have us believe, when the great mass of our clergy and

laity will be neither exclusively High nor Low nor Broad, but will hold together in a living synthesis, all that is truest and most distinctive in each of these great traditions; for I do not believe that the vital principles for which they stand are mutually incompatible, rather they are correlative and complementary to one another. But in order that this longed-for fusion and unity may be brought about, it is essential that all should have equal chances of doing their best, and the matter of training for the ministry is a most important element in the process of its realisation.

To come more to particulars. Though we may differ among ourselves as to ideals and methods, we are all, I think, agreed in being profoundly dissatisfied with things as they are. The rest of this paper I propose to devote to the expression of some of my own dissatisfactions, as they have been borne in upon me since I entered a Theological College (Cuddesdon) in 1906, and more especially since I became Principal of Wells (in 1911), and I wish also to try to sketch some of the reforms which I should like to see introduced. I may add by way of personal explanation that my experience has been almost exclusively limited to the training of ordinands from Oxford and Cambridge. I have had to deal with a few men from other Universities, and a few non-graduates, but these latter have all been men with a public school education, and generally they have had some professional qualifications as well, *e.g.*, as officers in the Navy and Army, or as lawyers.

I am above all profoundly dissatisfied with the meanness and meagreness of the special training which we offer to our clergy, compared with the special training required by other professions, and by other Churches for their ministries. Little wonder that this is so, seeing that the Church of England devotes next to nothing of its great endowments to this purpose, and expects its ordinands to pay for their training almost entirely, helping the poorer men as best it can out of precarious subscriptions, raised by societies or private effort, and regarded by the Church at large as a sort of charity, which the pious and wealthy

may support if they like, but which is in no way an essential element in the Church's sinews of war. Perhaps the new scheme of Church Finance may alter this, but I doubt it, unless we wake up the public conscience. The result of this extraordinary state of affairs is that all that we can do is to insist on a confessedly inadequate minimum, and even here to make endless exceptions. No wonder the ministry is regarded as the soft option among the professions, and that in consequence we do not attract to it our due share of able young men. No wonder the Theological Colleges are regarded by the laity at large with indifference, if not with suspicion and contempt; for the most part they are institutions of private origin, privately managed, unendowed, run on the cheap, with the problem of how to be self-supporting overshadowing every other educational consideration. All credit to them if under these circumstances Theological Colleges are not really half as bad as they are commonly painted; but still, they are not half as good as they ought to be, and they will never take the place they ought to take in the Church's consideration and esteem till the Church realises that really efficient educational institutions cannot be erected or run on these lines. Not until this fundamental evil has been overcome by adequate financing, can we hope to have Theological Colleges and a clerical training worthy of the name, where the length and nature of the course will be determined solely by educational considerations: not "what can we afford?" or rather "what can the students afford?" but "what will best promote the production of an efficient ministry?"

Why are we all profoundly dissatisfied with our present methods of training for the ministry? Because those methods are producing a set of ministers who, on the whole, cannot truthfully be said to be increasing the healthgiving influence of the Church, and that in spite of the undoubted fact that for the most part the younger clergy are every bit as earnest, conscientious, and hard working as their elders. In spite of all their good intentions and their zeal they, and the Church through them, are failing to interest, let alone to influence and lead, the

head and soul of the nation. And the reason why the layman refuses to take the young curate as seriously as he takes the young officer or the young doctor, is that he is shrewdly convinced that the curate does not know as much about his job as the officer and doctor do; he is a well-meaning amateur, let loose on the public, to make experiments in the care of souls, and to learn by bitter experience that he has been making rather a fool of himself, or worse still, to persist, all unconsciously, in his folly.

And where is it he mostly fails? In his knowledge of human nature and human life, and in his intellectual grasp of the principles of the Christian faith. The former of these requirements cannot be got by going through any curriculum, however long and liberal; the remedy must be sought outside our colleges, but the training of the intellect is essentially a matter of teaching and method, and with this the Universities and Theological Colleges are intimately concerned.

Leaving aside the important question of non-graduate clergy, whether there ought to be any at all, and if so, how they ought to be trained, and taking it for granted that in the future, as in the past, the great majority of the clergy will be men with degrees from either an ancient or a modern university, the question rises, "Shall we encourage would be-ordinands to take Theology as their degree course whenever possible?" This would be a cheap way of securing for them a longer, and fuller, and more systematic study of theology than a year or two's course at some Theological College after graduation. Nevertheless I am inclined to advise undergraduates not to read theology, not from any objection to the Theological Schools at the Universities *qua* Theological, but because I feel that the other schools are, with the possible exception of Law, everyone of them calculated to give a would-be parson a better mental training, wider interests, and a humaner outlook. I should like to see theology removed altogether from among the number of subjects in which a B.A. degree can be obtained, and put among the subjects for post-graduate study at the Univer-

sities. Let us keep our undergraduate University course for Arts, not for Divinity; only so can we secure that our ordinands shall have a good general basis on which to build their theology, when the time for specialised study comes. I may add that I should like to see group D. and its Cambridge equivalent, the Theological Special, banished from the tempting possibilities open to the pass-man; I am sure that both the religion and the theology of our ordinands would be gainers by their disappearance. What I am urging would apply with equal force, *mutatis mutandis*, to degree courses at the other Universities. My contention is that our clergy to be efficient must be given as broad and humane an intellectual outlook as possible, and that theological and clerical specialisation had better be entirely postponed until after they have taken their degrees.

Assuming then that the ordinands with whom we have to deal have all contrived by hook or by crook to secure some sort of degree at some sort of University, and that a degree in which theological learning has had no part, what sort of specialised training ought the Church to provide for them? It can be considered under the three heads—practical, intellectual, and spiritual. All alike will require some period of quiet and concentrated spiritual discipline, but not all will require the same amount of practical intellectual training. In fact we can divide our supply of ordinands into two classes: (1) a large class, whose interests and abilities turn naturally to practical and parochial duties, men whose intellectual abilities do not rise above low honours or a pass degree; and (2) a much smaller class who have shewn by their success at the Universities that they are possessed of intellectual capacities which will enable them with profit to themselves and the Church to pursue a systematic post-graduate course of theology. These two classes require different treatment; but, and on this I would most strongly insist, they both alike need careful spiritual training.

Now however many and however just may be the criticisms levelled at our Theological Colleges as regards the efficiency

of their practical and intellectual training, all who have any right to judge in the matter are agreed in this, that they do succeed in a very remarkable degree in instilling into their students a spirit of devotion and prayer and worship and a deep sense of vocation. I would urge that in our ideal reconstruction of the course of training for our clergy, our existing Theological Colleges should continue to carry out, more or less on their present lines, this most important work, and that *all* our ordinands should come under its influence; but I also urge that that influence cannot be all that it ought to be, if into a year's course of some thirty odd weeks there has also to be crammed a considerable amount of intellectual, and so-called "practical" or "parochial," training.

Clearly we must insist on more than one year as a minimum of post-graduate specialised training. Other Churches and other professions insist on it, why should not we? Only because we are too easy-going and too short-sighted to face the expenditure it would require.

But granted that the necessary money were forthcoming, and that the need of at least two years' training of some sort between degree-taking and ordination were recognised and insisted on, how is that period to be spent?

Not, I would urge, all of it at any theological college, but only the last year. The first year—or a longer period, when that is possible and desirable, as it well may be in some cases—must be spent elsewhere; where and how will depend on the character of the ordinand in question, and on which of the two classes, the "practical" or the "intellectual," he belongs to.

If he is "practical," *i.e.*, if he has only got an ordinary or low honours degree, and if it is clear that his tastes are not primarily theological, I would urge that he be required to spend a year in some great town, either at some recognised settlement, or as a lay-helper in some suitable well-organised parish, with the right sort of *parochus* at its head, appointed by the Bishop with this purpose in view. This year would be spent partly in gaining experience among both the poor and the well-to-do, of

economic, political, and social conditions, partly in study, attending lectures at the local university or technical schools, on social and economic subjects, and on teaching method, and also another course of lectures, given by local clergy and others, on elementary theology, in the course of which he might complete his preliminary study of the Bible, and get a grounding in the principles of Church doctrine and worship. There should be periodical examinations both in the social and in the religious subjects, and not until the ordinand had passed these satisfactorily, and received a diploma to that effect, should he be regarded as eligible for admission to a theological college, for his final year of preparation. Such a scheme as this would provide for a wide variety of tastes and capacities; it would not necessarily be very expensive; it should be run on inter-diocesan lines, seeing that not every diocese contains a suitable centre for its application; the examinations should be managed by a Central Board for this "Preliminary Examination of Graduate Ordinands," with suitable theological and social subjects sub-committees. The standard would not necessarily be very high, but those awarded the diploma would have to shew themselves possessed of a good, common sense, working knowledge of the Christian faith, in its broad outlines, and of present day social conditions. Having secured this, the theological colleges might take them in hand with some hope of presenting them for ordination a year later more or less adequately prepared for the everyday work of an ordinary curate.

If on the other hand the ordinand is of the "intellectual" type, *i.e.*, if he has got a good degree, or if he is strongly recommended by his University tutors as the sort of man for special training, he should be required to reside for at least a year's post-graduate study of theology at some University, not necessarily his own, but any University where a suitable course is provided. The course would be normally one year, and it would cover the subjects at present usually taken by a student, who having already got his degree in some other school or

tripos, stays on to read theology as a second school. These men would have to read hard and steadily; they would be under the special tuition of University professors and tutors, and would lay the basis of what we might hope would prove a life-long and progressive study of theology, for theology's sake. Thus we should year by year recruit the all too meagre ranks of student clergy, capable of dealing with intellectual and ecclesiastical problems as they arise, in a scholarly and well-informed spirit. Small hostels at the Universities might be provided for these men, and in any case they should be required to obey some rule of conduct as to daily attendance at chapel services, and hours of work, and devote certain afternoons to parochial work. At the end of their year (or two years where they could afford it, with the help of prize studentships, or otherwise) they should take an examination set by the University Board of Theology, and those who passed it with distinction should be given the B.D. degree, which would, in these cases, correspond, *mutatis mutandis*, to the B.C.L. at Oxford, as at present constituted. Having taken their B.D., or at any rate satisfied the examiners, they should proceed to some Theological College for their final year of preparation.

The Theological Colleges, if this scheme ever got into working order, would be composed of students who had not only got some sort of degree, but had also had some suitable post-graduate preparation for a final year of specialised, and more or less concentrated training. They would be able to simplify their courses, and would not have to crowd so much into a short period. They would be able to count on a certain amount of knowledge among their students, both of a theological and practical kind, and would not have to seek to generate it *ab initio*. They would be able to dispense with their "practical training," which is often of an artificial and mischievous nature, and if their own college examinations, with the help of an external examiner, were allowed to count as equivalent to the purely intellectual and technical part of the various Diocesan Ordination Exams., they would be relieved from

the necessity of cramming their men to meet the very variegated requirements and points of view of the different Bishops and their examining chaplains.

The life and work of the Theological Colleges would immediately become less crowded and constrained; men would have time to think, and read and discuss, and their devotional life would be strengthened *pari passu* with their intellectual interests. And if the colleges were properly financed and staffed, the teaching would be of a freer, and less mechanical order, there would be less dictation, and fewer cram-books would be used, and "reach-me-down theology," (as I once heard it called) would tend to disappear. The different colleges would no doubt preserve their particular traditions, but they would be the same "with a difference," for the real mischief in our present system is not so much that it turns out clergy who are either High, or Low, or Broad, but that it turns out clergy who are ignorantly, narrow-mindedly, mechanically, whatever they may happen to be; and this is not because the colleges wish them to be ignorant, narrow-minded, and mechanical, but because the students, under our present system, have for the most part, the greatest difficulty in being anything else. Give them more time, wider opportunities in their training, and this evil will be removed.

As I have already insisted more than once, no really adequate reform can be set working until the Church determines to finance its system of clerical training liberally and steadily. Doles to poor students will not do it; the stipends of its teachers and trainers, whether principals of colleges, lecturers, tutors, heads of settlements, or incumbents of parochial training centres, must be adequate, they must not depend solely or even mainly on students' fees; they should be a charge on the general resources of the Church. That is only one item, though an important one, in the case for financial reform.

I would conclude by saying that I do not believe a clergyman's training is over when he is ordained Deacon, or even

Priest; post-ordination study and practical training should be systematised and developed. But this is a matter for Diocesan Bishops and their staffs; I would only insist now that the best thought-out schemes of clerical training before ordination will fail of their purpose, if the young parson, as soon as he has passed his Priests' examination, feels that he has learnt all that is to be learnt, or at any rate need be learnt; he must be encouraged, and, if necessary, coerced, to go on learning. The means to be used for this purpose are however beyond the scope of our present consideration; I would only say that the question of how best to train our clergy for ordination is very closely and vitally connected with the question of how best to employ them when they are ordained.

THE LAITY AND THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

By W. B. Gordon.

The question I propose to consider in this paper is whether there is anything to be gained by, or any need for, the establishment of a system of real representation of the Laity in the various Councils of the Church. As a necessary preliminary to such consideration, however, it would seem desirable to have clearly in our minds what—from one point of view at any rate—we suppose the Church to be.

If we were asked what constitutes a Nation, the answering thought in our minds would comprehend all the people without distinction of caste, class, office or function. It would only be when we began to analyse the organisation of the Nation and the respective and relative functions of the various sections of the people that we should think of a King, a Parliament, a defensive force, and the numerous spiritual, intellectual, capitalist, and manual workers. No section can be thought of as governing or working by itself or for itself without the

co-operation in some form or other of all the others. The scheme is one of inter-dependence in working out the common good.

In the same way, in thinking of the Church, we must not let our minds dwell on one section of it only, but must try to apprehend it as a whole, and regard the laity as an integral part working, in harmony with other sections, for the common good of the whole Church.

It follows therefore as a general principle that it is the layman's duty, indeed his right, to assume a part in the deliberations and work of the Church of which he is a member.

Let us go further and see how this principle can be supported in detail.

The first departments of a Church's work which naturally occur to us for consideration are the higher and more strictly spiritual functions associated with Biblical Study, Doctrine and Worship. These are essentially subjects for those who are specially qualified by reason of their self-dedication, their study and thought, and the Grace of God which is in them. Even in regard to such questions, however, the Ministers of Religion might derive some light if they were to encourage the layman to speak his mind with a sense of responsibility. At present the layman's thoughts and comments are as a rule critical only. But if he were given an opportunity of expressing responsible views, his ill-thought-out criticism might be converted into sober and considered judgment, the Minister might be led to understand better the bearing and effect of his teaching, and there might be a lessening of the cleavage, and an increase of understanding sympathy between Pastor and Flock. As regards Liturgy and Ceremonial, much the same might be said—although the right of the layman to a voice in regard to these may be greater.

We do not want any such questions to be made the subject of general and unrestrained debate, although even such debate might not be worse than the carping criticism of to-day. But they so closely affect the vital interests of the layman, and

his want of technical knowledge and theological learning may so often be balanced by his experience of life, that his views are entitled to respectful hearing. The only means of allowing such hearing lies in some system of representation. The clergy need not fear that by any such means the authority or position which is rightly theirs would be weakened. The layman appreciates specialisation, and the responsibility thrown upon him would tend to make him respect and give effect to the conclusions of the specialist. Clergy and laity see life and its problems from different points of view, and one point of view should be helpful to the other when both are considered.

Leaving this difficult question, touching the highest functions of the Church, I shall feel greater confidence in speaking of other departments of work.

As a first example let me take the thorny question of religious education. It has, to the great loss of the community, been thrown into the cockpit of party politics. The only medium through which the average layman has been able during the prolonged discussion to express his views has been his political party. A large number of lay Churchmen have thus been thrust into the position that they could not approve either of the action of their party, or (in their entirety) of the demands made in the name of their Church. Their influence in moulding the issues has therefore been lost. The position and influence of the Church on the whole question would have been stronger if there had existed a body actually representative of all sections of the laity as well as of the clergy, in which such men, without disloyalty to their Church, might have put forward their point of view, and a claim (possibly a modified one) might have been made in the name of a united Church. The last contentions of the authorities of the Church on this question have centered round the right of the parent to choose the form of his child's religious education. No one could put such contentions forward with greater force than the parents under a proper system of representation, and no one has a better right to be consulted before being made the centre of a con-

troversy. Here then is a subject on which the lack of true representation of the laity has been a source of weakness to the Church,—as well as of injustice to the laity themselves, many of whom, by reason of such lack, have been driven to the choice between an appearance of disloyalty to their Church, and an effort to smother their conscientious opinions.

If we consider the Sunday Schools next, they certainly are not characterised by the greatest efficiency. Their failure to meet the requirements of recent generations is shewn by the falling away of a large proportion of scholars from Church life as soon as they reach an age of independence. At present the responsibility lies with the clergy alone. But there are among the laity parents, workers and past workers in the Sunday Schools, expert teachers, and men and women with knowledge of the life of the people affected. These might give valuable help in solving the numerous problems. Yet they cannot do so, because there is no representative body in or through which they can convey their wishes or the conclusions to which their experience and thoughts have led them.

But religious education in one form or other should not cease with the ending of either the School or even the University career. If the religious education has been on right lines up to that time, the boy or girl will not wish it to cease, because it will be too great a thing to be dropped out of their lives. But if they do wish to continue it, there is no organisation to meet that wish and keep it alive. There is nothing except the pulpit,—and in some parishes Bible classes which meet the wants of some, but are scarcely designed for those whose previous education has been more than elementary. Numbers of parents view this state of affairs with apprehension and regret as they see their children grow out of direct parental control, and develop their own thoughts and ways. The Public School Boy may at school have as near an approach as now exists to a system of religious education such as Canon Glazebrook outlined in his paper, but when he comes home for holidays, and later when he goes out into life, he

must often listen to teaching from the pulpit which ignores or denies what he has learned at school, and there is no means of encouraging him to continue study and thought on the lines on which he has been taught. As a result he avoids the Church, and supposes that he can carry out his ambitions of service without its aid. The parents who see this going on are powerless to procure any alteration, because they have no effective voice in the affairs of the Church which is responsible.

I have taken the subjects of education as my primary examples because it is in regard to them that I feel the need to be greatest. As regards the Church's social activities, and still more her Home and Foreign Missions work, there ought to be no need to urge that the laity should have some means of helping to shape policy.—if for no other reason than the sordid one that they provide the funds to carry on the work.

As to Church Finance, the advantages of giving to laymen a large share in control seem glaringly obvious. In Diocesan finance this is now recognised. Although the Diocesan Finance Committee can hardly be called representative, the fact that it contains a large proportion of laymen has already produced substantial improvement in Diocesan business arrangements, as well as increased interest in Diocesan affairs. But in the parish itself the parson still refuses to be relieved from the anxieties and labours connected with his Church's business affairs. One frequently hears him say that if he did not do it no one would. This may be true as matters now stand. But if the Vicar had a Parochial Church Council elected by his people, and if that Council had a Finance Committee under the chairmanship of the People's Warden, he would soon find his people answer to the responsibility, which they now leave alone because they think that he wants to control the work himself.

In all the work of the Church, therefore, I urge that the layman should be allowed a responsible voice through a system of real representation. It is his right, and the Church will be strengthened if it is given to him.

It is matter of satisfaction that something is being done to promote this object by the Representative Church Council,—although I do not know whom that Council represents. How far the schemes they promulgate will be of value depends on two considerations—first, whether the representation is in practice made a reality; and secondly, whether the deliberations of the various representative bodies are allowed to have fruition in action. The second question depends largely on the first. A really representative body will not for long be content to be only a debating society. It is to be hoped, therefore, that clergy and laity will combine to make the representation real. The root of the scheme lies in the Parochial Church Council. If it is actually representative of the congregation, and is allowed such responsibility as will make it a live body, it will see that it has representatives able and willing to carry its vitality into the work of the wider bodies of which it should be the germ. But in many Parishes there is no Church Council. In others the Council is not representative, but owes its origin to the act of the Incumbent, who creates it, nominates its members, prepares the *agenda*, presides over the meetings, does most of the talking, and afterwards elects whether or not he will carry out its decisions.

Let us hope that the new scheme will inaugurate a new era. In order that it may do so, the authorities of the Church, and the leading laymen in it, should make a strong appeal to the laity to rouse themselves and do their share to make the scheme effective—not because it is a perfect scheme, but because it is a step in advance, and full of possibilities. A similar appeal, with all the authority that can be put into it, might well be made to the clergy to give the scheme a welcome; to make it known throughout their congregations; and to help to establish it firmly.

To-day the Spirit of Service is abroad. The Church should not be behindhand in giving full freedom to that Spirit to work in her own body and help her to fulfil her destiny.

THE FEAST AND THOSE WHO ARE BIDDEN.

By the Rev. F. D. Cremer, M.A., Vicar of Seaford, formerly Rector of Keighley, and Hon. Canon of Ripon.

We, Broad Churchmen, yield to none in loyal attachment to our National Church, and in respect for those who sit in Moses' seat; but in order to enter into the spirit, and understand the principles of that Feast which we are met to study, our first care must be to go back to the Feast's own Founder. And if His mind and will prove to be clear, His commandment beyond question or cavil, our next care must be to make sure that God's Word from His mouth has not been made of none effect by men's accumulating traditions. For in thus dealing with traditional Church ordinances, we have not only His clear precept to guide us, but His clear example.

Our 25th Article lays down that "there are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel;" and later on the same Article explains the phrase to mean that these two Sacraments "have a visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." The accessories with which this visible sign (whether it be a plunge in water or a partaking of a meal) has been reverently fenced about at different times and places by different bodies of Christians are confessedly of man's device, for Our Lord Himself is never reported to have prescribed any outward form of Church ritual, government or discipline. Indeed it is doubtful whether He ever meant to prescribe exact verbal repetition of the one simple form of words which we call His Prayer. It is worth remembering that one of our accounts does not report His words as "when ye pray, say" but "after this manner pray ye."

Thrown back solemnly and deliberately as we are again and again by our Church upon the Sacred Records as our ultimate authority, our thoughts and judgments about the Sacraments

cannot but depend a good deal on the very best and soundest knowledge of these Records that it is in our power to obtain.

Our first duty is then to find out, if possible, the intention and aim of the Divine Founder by honest examination of such passages of Holy Scripture as throw light on the institution. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid"—by Him.

Our next duty will be to see that what we build thereon is no mere destructible "wood, hay, stubble," but "precious and enduring stones," like the marble of the Corinthian Temples.

The adjuncts and accessories wherewith different Churches celebrate (*i.e.*, do honour to, reverently call to mind) the Last Supper of the Lord, and the rules about modes and manners of administration which prescribe, among other things, what officers shall be responsible for the same, are beyond question in their own power, and can be promulgated for their own members with authority; for "the Church" as our 20th Article says, "hath power to decree rites and ceremonies," so long as it does not pretend that such accessories, whether for ornament or edification, are in any sense necessary to salvation, or essential to the validity of the Institution as it was ordained by Christ Himself.

It is hardly possible to read in the Gospels about even common meals without coming to the conclusion that there must have been something striking and characteristic about the way our Lord was wont to break bread after looking up to heaven and blessing God; something that impressed itself on the Disciples' memories. Not only at Emmaus was He "known to them in the breaking of bread." In the visions of the Seer at Patmos, He appeared just thus, in the old way to His faithful Disciples, to sup with them and bid them sup with Him. He was wont, it would seem, on all occasions—as if He attached importance to the symbolic act,—after looking upward for Eucharist ("saying grace" as we call it) to break up His own flat cake or "loaf" of bread in a significant way and share it with His

Disciples.[1] If this be so, He was but adding new associations, new suggestions, more solemn and deeply impressive than ever before, when on the night before He suffered He called the loaf and the cup, before breaking the bread and distributing the fruit of the vine, "His Body and the New Covenant in His Blood."

When in the very earliest mention we possess of the Sacrament St. Paul uses the shortened phrase, "The Bread we bless," (for "The Bread over which we say the Blessing, the Thanksgiving or Eucharist") he lays no emphasis on the word "we," which is non-existent in the Greek. To him the common partaking of the one loaf symbolized our unity with Christ and with one another, and recognition of common membership in the Body. Thus any greediness, any refusal to share with the very poorest, even any lack of politeness in not "tarrying one for another," was a proof of failure to "discern the Lord's Body."

Again, we cannot honestly ignore the fact that our Lord's Institution was so closely connected as to be almost bound up with a sociable Supper, a sort of Love Feast; nor did He give any hint that He wished it ever to be otherwise. For a century at least it remained so. The thought of loving communion and fellowship, of heart to heart talk with each other and with their Master, was indelibly stamped on the memory of the Apostles as associated with the quiet of the evening meal. The broken bread was probably, the cup was certainly passed round and so shared. "Take this and divide it among yourselves."

Not until the Church had allowed the ideal of a uniform outward system called "organic corporate union" to take the place of the Master's principle of unity of spirit; not until some of her authorities had come to define that union in terms recalling the Levitical Law rather than the Gospel (terms that emphasized Ecclesiastical love of domination and exclusiveness

[1] Perhaps there is something to be gleaned from the beautiful Spanish Legend which tells of our Lord and St. Peter travelling about together, and ever and anon being joined as they sat down to a meal by some needy wayfarer. St. Peter is represented as always murmuring that enough food had only been provided for themselves. However, whether their hospitality was claimed by one or more, our Lord is represented as always giving St. Peter the same quiet rejoinder, "What is enough for two is enough for three. What is enough for three is enough for four," and so on.

rather than Christian comprehensiveness and charity) was it possible for the Sacrament to be regarded otherwise and used as a "mark of difference" rather than a seal of fellowship and common loyalty to our own Master.

The fears of the old Evangelicals have after all been justified. They always insisted that members of the Church of England, to be loyal to her general teaching, should share her stern determination to cling to the word "Table" in the Service, and that alone. It seemed but a trifling concession to allow the word "Altar" to be re-introduced, and we disliked to make a *σκάνδαλον* of a mere word, but it has proved like a tiny leak in the dykes by which the Dutch keep out the invading sea, for the Doctrine of the Mass to escape which has meant so much to our Church has now come in like a flood in spite of all the defences raised in our Prayer Book to keep it out. Yet the Mass is based on teaching completely alien from the very essence of the new Covenant, and eventually leads to the substitution for the joyful simplicity of the Christian Revelation of "another Gospel that is not a Gospel," wherein God is thought of as one whose favour and mercy are only to be bought by gifts and sacrifices with all the dreary round of a complicated priest-prescribed ritual.

There are two ideas of Sacrifice arising from two ideas of God. Nothing can bridge the gulf between them. There is the Pagan and Levitical conception of sacrifice: and there is that held up by the greatest of the Hebrew Prophets and Psalmists, and fulfilled in the life and teaching and death of Christ, viz., the complete offering of self, body, soul, and spirit, the merging of the human will with the Divine. This prophetic, this New Covenant, this Christian idea of sacrifice, takes for granted a loving Father whose property is always to have mercy. He reveals in His Son the Heart of Sacrifice that belongs to His Own Divine nature, and proves to us that the only acceptable Sacrifice that can be offered to Him as "full and sufficient," is the sacrifice of the will, the self. Are not these the first principles of the Doctrine of Christ? Ought it

to be necessary to re-assert so far down the ages (about the two notions of sacrifice) "He taketh away the first that He may establish the second?"

We may only partake spiritually (*i.e.*, in our own spirits) in Christ's Sacrifice in so far as we "drink in" the same spirit, become spiritually one with Him, merge our human personality, unite our humanity with His—in Hebrew phrase "eat His flesh and drink His blood." By the Cross has the Father revealed His mind, His will, His heart of love, to a sinful world. This is God's own chosen instrument to unlock and melt hard and cold hearts.

> "We *draw nigh in faith.*" "*We, Thy humble servants, desire thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.*" "*Here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.*" We pray that we may be "*fulfilled*, (attain full growth) *with God's grace and heavenly benediction.*"

To hark back, with Geneva, to the old pagan and Jewish conception of a Sacrifice offered to appease the wrath of an angry deity; to teach, with Rome, that the Father who sent His Son needs a dramatic performance (that can only be performed through stated and prescribed formalities by a Sacerdos of the pagan or Jewish type) in order to remind Him over and over again that His favour has been bought and paid for; and to teach further that when He is under the spell of this reminder He will be more likely to give a favourable and kindly reception to our prayers and intercessions and to be merciful to ourselves,—however effective in stirring up religious emotion, however acceptable it may be,—is not Christianity.

This, my brothers, this falsification of the foundations of our Christian Faith: this caricature of the joyful Gospel of "Atonement with the Father through becoming incorporated with the Son:" this obscuring of God's Revelation of Himself in Christ, is the *fons et origo* of all the difficulties which we are now discussing as Kikuyu problems.

It seems clear to a disciple of Dr. Edwin Abbott that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, finding evidence (perhaps even in the writings of St. Matthew and St. Luke) that a material

conception of Sacramental union with Christ was not far off, took care after his manner delicately to undercut the wrong teaching that was creeping in. Though the actual institution of the Sacrament is not mentioned by him, he introduces a discourse of our Lord quite early in His ministry connected not with the Last Supper, but with the feeding of the multitudes, in order to make it clear that our Lord's teaching about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood was entirely spiritual.

I ventured to hope that if I entered the subject by this door; if we recalled together (letting the scales of habit, prejudice, ecclesiastical fashion and priestly tradition fall from our eyes) the Institution as it came from the Founder, that I should have taken you to the heart of the subject. Has this my hope been fulfilled?

Thus, and thus only—so at least it seems to me—would ecclesiastical rules and traditions fall into their proper place. The rulings of those who sit in Moses' seat must be respectfully listened to. But even while we know how to bow to authority, we of the Churchmen's Union know also what to believe and what to work for. We are determined that no "peace talk" shall persuade us to barter away our liberty in Christ or even our liberty as members of the Church of England. We stand for unflinching and uncompromising witness to "the truth as it is in Jesus," as a note of the true Church of Christ.

THE REPRESENTATION OF CHURCHWOMEN.

By Miss K. M. Emery.

The thesis I have to uphold in this paper is that women are part of the laity, and as such to claim for them a share in the representative government of the Church. I must begin by outlining briefly the past and present position assigned to women in the actual schemes for the representation of the laity in the Church of England.

These schemes include several stages. The Parochial Church Meeting elects lay representatives to the Ruri-decanal Conference (or, in a few dioceses, sends one lay representative direct to the Diocesan Synod), the elected lay members of Ruri-decanal Conference elect lay representatives to the Provincial Houses of Laymen, which also form, with the Bishops and the Houses of Clergy, the Representative Church Council, which meets annually in July. This Central Representative Church Council of the two provinces of Canterbury and York hopes some day to obtain recognition as the statutory legislative assembly of the Church of England, hence its immense importance, and the need of making sure that it does really represent the mind of the Church in its entirety.

Till 1914 the central scheme for the Representation of the Laity recognised women as voters in the Parochial Church meeting only if they were householders, *i.e.*, if they were "owners or occupiers," in addition to the qualifications demanded from men, that they should have "the status of a communicant," and be over 21 years of age. Some individual dioceses had already gone further. In many, women serve on Parochial Church Councils, which are at present purely voluntary bodies, chiefly existing in large and well organised

parishes only. In a few, women serve on Ruri-decanal Conferences, and in one or two dioceses desire had been expressed to make women eligible to serve as Lay Representatives in the Diocesan Conference.

In July, 1914, the Representative Church Council passed a new scheme, and definitely voted on the motion:—

> "That women be admitted to the parochial lay franchise on the same terms as men, and that in Rule 4 the word 'persons' be substituted for 'laymen.'"

The result of the voting was as follows:—For the motion, Bishops 22, Clergy 90, Laity 76; total 188. Against the motion, Bishops 3, Clergy 15, Laity 72; total 90.

The motion was therefore carried by a majority of 98, the vote of the Bishops and clergy being overwhelmingly in its favour.

Incidentally it may be noticed that the Representative Church Council thus settled for itself the vexed question whether a woman is a "person," though by a legal quibble the solicitors of England and the S.P.G. still refuse to grant that a woman is a "person."

The Representative Church Council further passed, without opposition, a resolution:—"That lay representatives on Parochial Councils may be women," but negatived the motion:—"That if a Diocesan Conference so decides, women may sit as lay representatives on the Ruri-decanal Conferences, and on the Diocesan Conference." In this case the voting was as follows:—For the motion, Bishops 13, Clergy 36, Laity 27; total 76. Against the motion, Bishops 8, Clergy 39, Laity 94; total 141. Therefore 61 who had voted on the question of the lay parochial franchise abstained from voting on women's right to serve on the higher councils, and an overwhelming majority of the laymen voting were against the motion. One explanation of this inconsistent voting is that before the second vote was taken certain women in the gallery made a very unseemly interruption.

The Representative Church Council proceeded to pass a subsidiary resolution:—

> "That it is essential for the successful working of the Scheme for the Representation of the Laity that it should be accepted by all the dioceses of the two Provinces and, except so far as the Scheme itself gives liberty of divergence to the several dioceses, should be carried out uniformly in every diocese; and this Council, therefore, urge upon every diocese the importance of accepting and putting into practise the Rules as to the Representation of the Laity which had been adopted by the Council."

This addendum makes it quite clear that the Representative Church Council has no power to command, or to enforce, the carrying out of its recommendations; each diocese can still be a law, and make a law, unto itself; but it is obvious that the matter should be at least discussed in each diocese. Very few dioceses have adopted the revised Scheme in the 14 months which have elapsed since it was promulgated, but the war preoccupations of the past year may account for this delay. The action taken in a few dioceses is noteworthy. Ripon adopted the Scheme in full in February, 1915; Wakefield had already given women the parochial franchise in October, 1913, and proposed to adopt the full Scheme in October, 1915, "now that the Council has admitted women to the franchise." Oxford has given women the parochial franchise, and in some rural deaneries women are serving as Ruri-decanal Secretaries to the Finance Board, though they may not serve on the Board itself; Worcester gave women the franchise and the right to serve on Parochial Councils in 1913, and has now passed a resolution that women may serve on the Ruri-decanal Conferences as elected members, and that each rural deanery may send one woman as a lay representative to the Diocesan Conference, but has deferred acting on this resolution till the whole question has been referred back to the House of Laymen, with a request that they would send it to the dioceses for discussion; York voted on the old franchise this year, but intimates that the new franchise will be adopted before the next triennial election.

The present position therefore is, that the question of the parochial lay franchise is settled theoretically, and theoretically women have the right to serve on Parochial Church Councils,

which, also theoretically, ought to be formed in every parish, in accordance with the scheme for Parochial Councils formulated by the Representative Church Council in July, 1915, but practically much remains to be done to make this theoretical scheme a working reality. The Diocesan Conferences should be urged to adopt the scheme, and Incumbents should be urged to inaugurate Parochial Councils and give them real power, and the laymen and women in each parish should be roused to value and claim their right to vote for lay representatives, for each qualified elector has to make personal application and sign a declaration before his or her name is inscribed on the electoral roll of the parish. It is very important that electors of all shades of thought should vote and exercise their influence in parochial elections, and not leave the dominant party in any parish to form the whole of the electorate, or allow representatives to be appointed without any real election at all, as in a case quoted by Sir Samuel Hoare:—

> "Let the Council realise that in Parishes of from 600 to 1000 people only two, three, or four people, and they perhaps the office bearers of the Church, took part in the election."

Members of Ruri-decanal Chapters and Conferences can do much to exert influence upwards on Diocesan Conferences, and downwards on the Parochial authorities, to bring about a better state of affairs than that now existing.

A good deal of prejudice will have to be overcome in many quarters in spite of the resolution of the Representative Church Council, before all dioceses will welcome women even as voters merely. Fears will be expressed lest they should be too numerous or too foolish. The best answer to these objections is experience, as stated by the Archbishop of York, who said:—

> "In my old parish of Portsea, not waiting until the conclusion of these prolonged debates, we had a full system of Church Councils, six minor Councils, merging in one larger Council, and to our women communicants as well as to the men the vote was entrusted. We found that it was the really intelligent and keen who voted, and that those of whom some have been so much afraid did not vote. I think that would be the case elsewhere."

The effect on the men of giving the vote to women was forecast by the Bishop of Winchester:—

> "If once women had the vote, men would be put on their mettle in a way which they had not been put to hitherto, to show that women did not take more interest in the matter than they did themselves."

To turn from the question of women as voters in the Parochial Meeting to women as representatives on the Parochial Church Council.

The two chief duties of the Parochial Council are thus enunciated in the new scheme:—

> "(1) Generally to assist the incumbent in the initiation and development in the parish of all departments of parochial church work, and in the extension of the Church at home and abroad. (2) To arrange, in conjunction with the incumbent and churchwardens, the parochial church budget."

Now we all know that it is women who are actually doing most of the personal and social church work in every parish, and that when money is required for any purpose their services are always sought as collectors, and it is obvious that they should have the right to serve on the Conucil which is to direct the work, and to spend or assign the money. In some well worked parishes it is arranged that all parochial organisations and societies, *e.g.*, C.E.M.S., the G.F.S., the Mothers' Union, the Choir, the Sunday School Teachers, Boys' Brigade, &c., should have representatives on the Council, running candidates for election by the Parish Meeting, or for appointment as "sidesmen" by the incumbent, and this would seem a very useful method of co-ordinating all work done in the parish. Another method was outlined in the scheme, viz., that of delegating different departments of work to committees, appointed by the Council, and consisting of members of their body and of other persons being members of the Church of England.

The qualifications of women to serve on councils or committees of any sort are the same qualifications as are needed in men: fitness to serve is a question of personality, not of sex. Women differ, as do men, between themselves, but women share with men at the present day most of the advantages of

higher education; they have been proved to possess common sense and intelligence, practical administrative ability, and intellectual apprehension of truth. They possibly exceed most men in their responsibility for the education of the rising generation, for the education of children is chiefly in their hands, whether as mothers or as school mistresses, and their keen desire to fit themselves for such work is shewn by the attendance at Study Circles, Vacation Biblical Schools, Summer Schools for Sunday School Teachers, &c., while they also qualify for social service by training at Settlements, C.O.S. centres, and by actual work in all the parishes throughout the land. They take an active part in most existing social and philanthropic organisations, and by visiting the poor in their homes learn to understand their points of view, so that they are especially well qualified to represent not only their own mind, but the mind of the average "laity" in the councils of the Church. If the object of lay representation is really to discover "the mind of the Church," that object cannot be fully attained till the "mind of women," as well as the "mind of men" is brought to bear on Church problems, for women are an integral part of the "laity of the Church."

Another strong argument for the direct influence of women in the councils, is that direct influence with responsibility, tempered by the free interchange of opinion and experience in committees, is far preferable to the indirect influence which cannot but be often exercised, and is not always exercised wisely, though very often great good to the community may spring from husbands consulting their wives at home, thus reversing St. Paul's advice.

I have tried to discover a rational answer to the question: "Why women should *not* be eligible to serve on Ruri-decanal and Diocesan Conferences?" and can find no logical answer at all. If a parish thinks a certain woman would represent it best, there seems no logical reason why the parish should not elect that woman as its representative. But there are practical

difficulties at present, which may be insoluble till public opinion has been considerably modified. These difficulties may be explained by quoting a statement from the speech of Lord Parmoor, the spokesman of the House of Laymen :—

> "When a great effort is being made to secure that a representative body such as the Representative Church Council should have further powers, so as to make the Church organisation and spiritual life practically independent of political life and of Parliament, it is necessary that the Diocesan Conferences and the Representative Church Council should be constituted in a way which would give confidence to the ordinary Churchman."

Quite apart from election and so-called direct representation, the Ruri-decanal and Diocesan Conferences might at once gain the advantage of the co-operation of a few of the best and most suitable women by co-opting them or appointing them as members of their own body or of special committees. This plan is followed in many statutory bodies, and works well, and I have often thought it should be compulsory on all Boards of Guardians and Educational bodies to co-opt women members if none are otherwise appointed. Co-option has the advantage of accustoming men gradually to work with women by giving them a few women colleagues whom some of them already trust, and thus disabuses them of many misconceptions as to the incapacity of women. The debate on the Representative Church Council seemed to concede to women the right to serve as ex-officio or co-opted members, and to grant to individual Conferences the power to appoint as many of such members as they wished, provided such members did not have the right to vote in the election of lay representatives to the higher bodies.

In conclusion, I desire to recall my thesis that women are part of the laity, and to claim that the laity, men and women alike, are part of the Church, and as such should share, not only in the social work and financial responsibilities of the parish or diocese to which they belong, but in directing the spiritual and intellectual life of the Church, to promote which is one of the objects of the Churchmen's Union.

THE PROMISE OF HIS COMING.*

By the Rev. F. J. Moore, B.A.
Chaplain to the 83rd Batt., Canadian Expeditionary Force.

"Where is the promise of His coming."—2 *Peter*, iii, 4.

The trumpet-call of Advent is to preparation for the coming of the King. In hymnody and homily, in scripture and in prayer, the Church speaks out its note of warning, and declares its faith and patient hope. What if year succeds to year, and age to age, and the Lord delays His coming—did He not promise, and shall we not trust? Did He not charge, and shall we not wait? Delay is not denial, and appearances need not be truth.

Faith, at anyrate, will be true to itself, if it believes the promise and grows not tired by waiting,—if it hopes for the dawn through a long and dreary night. Yet it is significant of the moulding power of time, that the doctrine of the Second Coming of the Lord has become an annual festival in the Church, and has taken its place as one of the many sides of Christian truth to be considered by the faithful as the years go round.

One cannot take up the fervid epistles of the New Testament without feeling that their writers had never foreseen the Advent Hope falling from a daily, intense expectation to the annual recollection of a promise, and the annual re-kindling of an unenthusiastic faith. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the early Christians expected the coming of the Son of Man in their own day. Their thoughts did not run to years, for they were living in the "last time." The Kingdom was near, the Lord was at hand, and any day might see the rending of the heavens and the triumph of the Saints. So the thought of Christ's return was with them no occasional thing. It was an eager expectation that ruled the actions of each succeeding day, —a stimulus to service here, and an effective cure for apathy

* A Sermon preached in St. James' Cathedral, Toronto.

and idleness there. "Maranatha"—"Our Lord cometh," said they one to another, speaking together softly of their hope; and never did they think that they would fall asleep before He came, or, if they did, they believed that they would quickly rise to meet Him in the air.

But the first generation of believers passed away, and the Lord had not yet come. And as another and yet another came and went, and there had been no sign from heaven, by delay and disappointment, eager expectation passed to patient hope, and what was once the daily watchword of the waiting Church has now become the timid, half-inspiring theme of a season's song.

It is true that in our Advent Liturgy we find the note of immediacy, but it evokes no response in our consciousness. As George Tyrrell has said, "Those who now expect the End at all no longer expect it immediately. . . . . Only now and then is there a recrudescence of apocalyptic panic in times of earthquakes, comets, war and pestilences."

To turn now to the words of our text, it will be seen that they form part of a warning given by the writer in view of the possibility of his readers being brought into ridicule because of the non-appearance of the Lord from heaven. Opponents of the faith would take hold of the fact of the Lord's delay, and would use it as an effective weapon against the truth of Christianity. They would say: "Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." And to the ordinary man there would seem to be no very effective answer. But not so to the writer of this epistle. In the first place, the appearance of scoffers was one of the marks of the "last days;" and in the second place, God did not measure time by earthly computations, and had some purpose of mercy in delay. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Men scoffed because they understood not the scriptures nor the power of God. The "day of the Lord" would most certainly come, and it would come as a thief in the

night. Let them therefore believe the promise, and keep their faith, and watch.

Now as a piece of Christian apologetic that argument was as natural as it was effective. It was natural, because the promise had certainly been made, and there were those still living who had heard it. Not many years, therefore, had gone by and left the promise unfulfilled. Besides, the Lord had not definitely said when He would come. He had only said that He would come, and had given them the command to watch. And it was effective, because the events of to-morrow can never be gauged by the incidents of to-day, and if human measurements of time have no place in the working out of the purposes of God, if all our "to-morrows" are God's "to-day," and the race's future God's ever-present "now," then the argument from time breaks down. Delay is a human term, and has no meaning in respect of God.

But we shall be safe in saying that when the writer of the Second Epistle of Peter penned this passage, he never for one moment thought that men would be making use of the same argument for precisely the same reason nearly two thousand years after his own time. And the question suggests itself: "Will the old argument stand?" When men ask us to-day, "Where is the promise of His Coming?" and point to the silence of two thousand years as a reason for unfaith, or for a broken hope, can we tell them that time has no meaning, and that delay does not affect the promise?

In other words, can the Church tell the world to-day, that in spite of the silence of twenty centuries, and in face of twenty centuries advance in knowledge, she still holds fast to the Advent Hope, and looks for the sign of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven?

Now let me say at once that there is a growing body of thoughtful men in the Church to-day, who believe that the day has gone for the old interpretation, and that the doctrine of the Second Advent needs to be re-stated in the light of our experience and of modern thought.

Let me remind you, very briefly, what the hope and belief of the early Christians was.

And it is important to remember, at the outset, that their conception of the last things goes back further than the time of Christ. It had its origin in the old hope of the triumph of Israel, and the establishment of a world-empire under the rule of Israel's God. As, however, "hope in the coming theocracy failed under the repeated blows of disappointment, a new generation of prophets left the world to its fate, as incurably given over to the powers of evil. Nothing was to be hoped for from the course of events; . . . . the kingdoms of this world (they came to believe) had been usurped by Satan. They could only be redeemed to God through the conquest of Satan and his angels by the Son of Man and His angels. God's Kingdom was not to grow out of earth but to descend upon it from above, ready-made and complete." *

And the coming of the Son of Man would be accompanied by strange physical phenomena. A trumpet would sound from heaven, and the stars would fall; the moon would be turned into blood, and the earth would tremble; in the clouds with the Son of Man would appear hosts of angels, and the dead would rise from their graves.

Now that conception was already in existence at the time of the birth of our Lord, and His disciples took it over and made it their own, with one important addition, namely, that their Master was the Son of Man who was to appear in the clouds of heaven and destroy the kingdom of Satan and bring in the kingdom of God. And, as I have said, they expected Him to appear in their own time, and they confidently looked for Him to come.

What, now, is there in all this that needs re-statement and re-interpretation? What is the difficulty in the way of our accepting the doctrine of the Second Advent precisely as it stands?

* Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 136.

Well, in the first place, we have seen that the early Christians were mistaken in their belief that Christ would come again in their own day. The world was not on the point of death, as they had thought, and twenty centuries of wonderful development have thrown open the windows of the world on a glorious vista that compels the belief that the human race is only just entering into life, and that the end is far away:—

> "Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life for which the first was made."

And, in the second place, a new astronomy has given us a conception of the world that will not admit of the old belief in the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, or in the details connected with it. We no longer believe in a flat earth with an arching sky above our heads, whose central point is visible to every eye upon the earth. The world is larger than the early Christians thought, in the heavens is more than they had seen. They spoke as they knew, but we can no longer think of the universe in their terms.

What, then, is left us of the Advent Hope? Having lost so much, what remains to us of the promise of His Coming?—how shall we look for His appearing? There remains to us all that was essential in the doctrine of the early Church. Stripped of its shell—the imagery in which it was conceived, the Advent Hope meant the triumph of Christ over the forces of evil in the world, and the inheritance of life eternal by those who had trusted in His name. The form in which that hope was cast, was the only possible form for contemporary ideas, and to expect to find it otherwise would be to look for the twentieth century in the first.

But though events have falsified the form, the substance still remains, and it is for us now to clothe it in the language and according to the thought of our time. And we can do it in full assurance of faith, and with a confident hope. For surely the promise of the Saviour's ultimate triumph is clearly seen in the onward movement of the world. Everywhere power is

passing into His hands, and we believe the day will come when He will be King over all the earth.

And there, at least, is one aspect of the Advent Hope as seen from the modern point of view. It is the coming of Christ into His kingdom in the world; the advent of the reign of righteousness and peace, the end of all iniquity and social wrong. But that is not all. The vision of the reigning Christ and of a redeemed Humanity reaches far beyond the wistful limits of the world, and rests in that abiding city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. "The world passeth away," and even if the Kingdom of God should even come upon the earth, the human race cannot exist for ever, and we ourselves must pass, ere long, to another sphere.

Science, no less than Scripture, tells us that the material world is temporal and will cease to be.

> "The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit shall dissolve,
> And, . . . leave not a rack behind."

So in our Advent Hope we look beyond the things that are seen to the unseen and eternal. We see the throne of Christ set in the heavens, with all things subject unto Him. We see the multitude, which no man can number, walking in the light of the City of God, and all the former things of earth are passed away. That is what we ultimately mean by the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the coming of "an order of transcendental experience, in which sorrow, pain, temptation, and sin, shall be done away; in which the moral struggle shall be explained, justified, and brought to eternal rest."*

And by no conception of the Second Advent can we hope for more. In reality, the fundamental hope of the old and its new interpretation is the same; for it is the permanent element in the old that forms the substance of the new.

"Maranatha"—"Our Lord Cometh" is still the watchword of the believing Church, and we look with faith and patience for the day when He shall take His power and reign, and His servants shall serve Him in the kingdom that has no end.

* Tyrrell. *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 126.

REVIEWS.

THE CHURCH AND THE NEW KNOWLEDGE.*

This volume of the Layman's Library, edited by Professors Burkitt and Newsom, is evidently not one written to order for the purpose of rounding off a series, but one in which the writer knows she has a mission to fulfil. It is based on a wide knowledge of the methods and results of recent research, and this, so far from undermining the Christian faith, seems to the writer to have given us cause for well-founded optimism for the faith, when rightly understood in its relation to the new knowledge. The book is a valuable one for the layman, and there are few clergy who would not profit by its reading. The inspiration of the book is infectious.

It is a plea for the inter-relation of science and religion. Christianity is not a hot-house plant. It is meant to take root in the ordinary life of man, and to grow and develop by means of all that builds up the fabric of human life. The kingdoms of science, as well as the kingdoms of the world, are meant to be the kingdoms of our God, and of His Christ, and the deeper scientific understanding of the faith is as important a part of the Church's mission as the spread of the faith among all nations—in short, may be an indispensable part of missionary success.

The earlier chapters sum up the results of the new knowledge which bear directly on man, regarded as a physical, psychical, and social being. The story of evolution shows the hopefulness of further progress, especially in mental power. Recent investigations in the problem of heredity show that there is no necessity for the race to degenerate, as the remedy is in our own hands. So with evil conditions of environment, which are man-made, and therefore remediable by man. Man has interfered with the normal processes of nature for his own ends, and by using his knowledge of nature's methods he can achieve the highest. Man's supremacy over nature is shown in his mind. We have powers that are only just beginning to be realised, that give the mind enormous ascendancy over the body, and the fuller recognition of these powers will go far towards making the body the instrument of the mind.

The chapter on habits is very valuable to this end. Hypnotism has shown that the mind can do almost anything it believes it can do. Weakness is due to our obsession with the things of the body, and the prevailing nervous degeneracy and lack of initiative are due to the fact that we have been so taken up with the dangers and diseases of the body, that we have almost lost confidence in the powers of will and belief. Yet these are the powers that psychic research shows to be supreme. Our mental life is larger than we are conscious of. The inspired men and geniuses of the race have been those who have used the reservoirs of sub-consciousness, and have shown the potentialities of the race. They have realised that their powers had a source not in themselves, but in a deeper Reality. Both science and religion seek the knowledge of this Reality.

From the standpoint of evolution, Christ may be regarded as the Ideal Man—the standard of human possibility, in whom all the potentialities of human nature became actualised. He came to herald the coming of man

* *The Church and the New Knowledge*, E. M. Caillard. Longmans, 2/6 net

into His kingdom. In full consciousness of His divine relationship He showed what man will be when he too realises his inheritance. The consciousness in Christ of a unique Sonship with God is verified by history, for He is becoming more and more recognised as the type of all that man will be when he realises his Sonship with the Father: "We shall be like Him."

The Church then has the mission of proclaiming and using all the possibilities of human nature. Its goal is not against nature, but the end of all evolution. Material things are to be all subdued to spiritual purposes, and what we know of natural laws must be used for the working out of the redemption of the body, individual and social. There is a force in nature sufficient to work out our redemption, if we use it. But we cannot do this if we concentrate all our thoughts on the body. Man controls his body by rising above it. The spiritual life is the life of power. The low standards of men arise through lack of faith, through the absence of real belief in the presence of God in the world. And in a materialistic age an effort is required, by concentration of mind on the invisible but more real world, in communion and prayer, to win the power that may be ours through faith.

There is no hope for the race in efforts simply to ameliorate external conditions. Inward regeneration is the prime necessity, and the Church should lead in both. The Church itself is powerless because of its weakness of faith, but history shows that when the need is greatest, power from Beyond never fails. Will the Church be fit to be the vehicle of that power?

What then lies before us? Christ manifested the possibilities for all men. Man will gain complete control of his own physical organisation. He will be able to exercise control over nature. He will gain perfect insight into and sympathy with his fellow-men. He will enter into full realisation of his Sonship to God, and consequently into perfect manifestation of love to and trust in Him. Then will the kingdom of God come, and on the new earth man will begin a still wider life, in which he will realise his part not only in earthly, but in cosmic evolution; death will lose its power, and the race mount onward to "the boundless perfectness" of God.

One may not agree with everything in the book. Here and there things seem to require a little modification. But the book is a thought-provoking one, and it shows how Christianity is in the heart of things. "Man is not man as yet;" he is still but "in the making;" and if the Son of Man is revealed afresh to us as the second Adam, the Head of a new regenerated Humanity, there are many who will be more likely to say: "Truly this was the Son of God."

A. J. HUMPHREYS, B.D.

THE EPHESIAN GOSPEL.*

Readers of Professor Gardner's New Testament studies, especially of his *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, to which the present volume may be regarded as a sequel, will need no reviewer to recommend this book. To others it may be said that they will do well to read this eminently sane and liberal estimate of the fourth Gospel, as a companion to Mr. E. F. Scott's work on the same

* *The Ephesian Gospel*, by Percy Gardner, Litt. D., F.B.A. (Williams & Norgate, London, 1915, 5/- net.)

subject, which hitherto, to the great reproach of our students, has stood almost alone in the English language.

Professor Gardner is content, in the main, to collect the results of modern research, rather than to strike out a line of his own; and the liberal view of the fourth Gospel rests on such strong evidence, and plays such an important part in current controversies, that this was thoroughly well worth doing. The way in which the evangelist felt himself free to treat Christian tradition; the Christological development to which he, as well as St. Paul, contributed; the spiritualizing of the eschatological framework of primitive Christianity; the growth of sacramentalism in contact with Greek and Oriental religions—are aspects of early Church history which cannot be too often or too forcibly urged.

As his title indicates, Professor Gardner makes much of the supposed Ephesian origin of the Gospel, and his early chapters, dealing with the influences among which the Johannine traditions took shape, are perhaps the most original part of the book. Quite rightly, he does not waste time in discussing at length the authorship of the Gospel. Granted its place of origin, and its general character, its authorship is a matter of little importance. Nevertheless it may be thought that he goes further than the evidence warrants in holding that the author had in his youth been converted by St. Paul, and had afterwards come "under the strong influence of St. John or one of his immediate followers" (p. 87). At any rate this theory calls for a more thorough examination of the structure and method of composition of the Gospel than Professor Gardner was able to attempt in the space at his disposal. There has been a tendency lately to gloss over the disarrangements and inconsistencies in the Gospel as though they were of minor importance, and to put down the contradictory views, which at times it undoubtedly expresses, to its author's "transitional" state of mind. But it is not impossible that we have here indications of something approximate to the "source and editor" structure which explains similar anomalies in some other books, and that we ought to regard the author of the discourses, not as the author, but as the editor, of the narrative portion of the Gospel. If such a position could be established it would lead to some modification in our treatment of the historical value and doctrinal nature of the Gospel. This applies particularly to the view that the "spiritualism" of the Gospel is counterbalanced by ritualism and sacerdotalism (*e.g.*, p. 330 foll.) Some at least of the passages on which the Gospel's concessions to ecclesiasticism are based can probably be shown, on analysis, to have been interpolated, *e.g.*, the mention of "water" in iii., 5, or the sacramental use of σάρξ in vi., 51-56. The modernism of the fourth Gospel is probably less Catholic, and more in the direct line of Jesus' uncompromisingly spiritual religion, than we like to allow.

This should not be taken as a criticism of Professor Gardner's work, but as a suggestion that the present attitude of critics towards the fourth Gospel, which he so excellently represents, is not likely to be final, and that one line of advance lies along the various attempts to partition the Gospel, unsuccessful as those have hitherto been.

Meanwhile, Professor Gardner's book ought to be upon every clerical bookshelf.

J.M.T.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

The Rev. W. Manning having resigned the Secretaryship of the Churchmen's Union, at the last meeting of the Council, the Rev. Cavendish Moxon was elected Hon. Secretary, with Miss D. Nussey and the Rev. J. M. Jeakes as Hon. Assistant Secretaries. The Council unanimously passed a vote thanking Mr. Manning for his long and valuable services, and elected him a Vice-President. It was also resolved at the same meeting to make a presentation to Mr. Manning on behalf of the Council.

The Faith and the War,* a volume of essays by members of the Churchmen's Union and others, edited by Canon-Foakes Jackson, has just been published. The Churchmen's Union members contributing essays are Professor Gardner, Canon Glazebrook, Canon Rashdall, Miss Alice Gardner, Rev. C. W. Emmet, and the Editor.

On Oct. 25th, the Dean of Durham addressed the Manchester & District Branch of the Churchmen's Union on "Some Probable Effects of the War in the sphere of English Christianity." Sir Edward Russell presided.

The Dean of Durham held that the outcry against all things German, and therefore against German criticism, would not permanently arrest the decay of interest in theology, in so far as that decay was caused by a real change of intellectual attitude and religious climate. After all, the decisive advances in physical science had been English rather than German, and even in Biblical criticism our home-born scholars were too strong and too many to be submerged by the anti-German wave. But no doubt there would be a change of fashion; obscurantist bigotry would enjoy a pleasant immunity from exposure; abuse of Germany would be a handy and convenient cloak for mental indolence and critical ignorance.

Secularism would perhaps have received a check. Life would be sterner and more sombre. In an atmosphere of bereavement there would be a new and salutary disgust of the shallowness and flippancy of mere secularism. If the churches had religion and wisdom enough to understand the situation they might commend themselves widely to the public conscience.

One of the tendencies to which he had referred was the drift towards Socialism. Probably that tendency would be strengthened and purified by the vast strain of the war. There must needs be some mitigation of class prejudices resulting from the experiences of these protracted campaigns. The English gentry never stood so high in the public regard as at the present moment, and he thought their natural leadership—the legitimate influence born of tradition, culture, and service—might play a great and salutary part in the economic revolution which would follow the war. The rise of the

* Macmillans, price 5/- net.

artisan was the root of modern Socialism. He wanted his place in the sun. Historic Europe, with its reigning dynasties, diplomatic methods, militarist groups, armies and navies, had been found wanting. On the morrow of the great tragedy would rise an insistent demand from the masses in every civilised community that some better system should be found, some effective security provided against a return of the sanguinary horrors which had darkened and wasted the world. The enormous expenditure of the war would entail the necessity of the utmost public economy for years to come, and so check expensive schemes of social reform.

Denominational combination, the Dean said, might arise, because the new fluidity of social life had forced the scandal and weakness of denominational division into prominence, and because the rapid expansion of religious work had forced men to realise the practical absurdity of denominational divisions. The war might be supposed to add stimulus to that tendency.

"Perhaps" the Dean of Durham concluded, "we may sum up the prospect in this way. While the immediate consequence of the war will be favourable to the Churches and unfavourable to religion, the more distant consequences will be favourable to religion and unfavourable to the Churches."

On 4th Nov., a service in connection with the Churchmen's Union was held in S. Paul's Church, Clifton, the Rev. Canon Haigh (vicar), the Revs. J. Gamble and J. F. Clayton officiating. The special preacher was the Rev. H. Handley. Taking his text "Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God." (Isaiah xl., 9), the preacher spoke of the people wanting the real God, not something verbal. The cities of England to-day, he said, were finding God in many ways. Men were finding God in natural science and in human history. They wanted also to find God in the depths, not only in the smooth ordinary course of life, in the struggle, in sin and sorrow, in the great experiences. The Church had been bearing witness to His eternal truth and love, throughout the ages, but the masses of the people were not found in the houses of prayer, and the great Labour movement looked with hostility towards the Church. There was something wrong in the Church of their forefathers. He thought the language of the Church was out of date and could not go on much longer unreformed.

They must work together patiently and insistently for the reform of the language of the Church. Another thing that he thought was necessary was the modification of the creeds. More important still was it that Churchmen should lead Christian lives.

The Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig during October and November has been delivering an interesting course of eight addresses at St. Sepulchre's Holborn, on *The Ideal of a Modern Churchman.* These will be published in the *Modern Churchman.* The first of the series will appear in our next number.

CORRESPONDENCE.

UNITED COMMUNION.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

After reading my paper on *United Communion* at the Rugby Conference I went on to explain, so far as time allowed, how "principle" bore fruit in "practice" at Eccles in 1906; for I was anxious to make clear that the occasion had been a worthy one as a *dignus vindice nodus* had actually presented itself. In your crowded "Conference Number" it would not have been reasonable to expect you to find room for this additional matter, but as you write that my Paper is one of those held over for next month, I venture to ask you to insert with it this brief account of what was, so far as I know, the first *United Communion* ever held on a large scale.

If you cannot spare room in the body of the magazine, perhaps you will admit it under the head of Correspondence?

Seaford Vicarage, F. D'Austini Cremer.
All Saints' Day, 1915.

In the Spring of 1906 a Circular Letter,* signed by our Archbishops and the Heads of almost all the other Religious Bodies in the land, was sent to all Christian clergy and ministers calling upon them to "make an effort of Prayer" on Whitsunday for the bringing about of *Visible Fellowship* among Christians.

"God helps those who help themselves!" So feeling that an effort of prayer must be accompanied by every other effort of a practical kind in our power before we should have any right to expect God's Blessing, I reprinted the Archbishops' Circular with an appeal to my own people added. In this I begged for a hearty and sincere response to so notable a challenge, pointing out that the United

---

* "Sir—We, who subscribe this letter, represent widely different Christian communities. We agree in deprecating at present any large schemes of corporate reunion, which seem to us premature, or any attempts to treat our existing religious divergencies as unimportant; but we agree also, in believing profoundly that *our Lord Jesus Christ meant us to be one in visible fellowship*; we feel profoundly the paralysing effect upon the moral forces of Christianity which our divisions inevitably produce; and we recognise with the fullest conviction that it is the duty of all Christians, who desire in this respect the fulfilment of the Divine purpose, to give themselves to penitence and prayer—to penitence, because we have all, in various ways, as bodies and as individuals, contributed to produce and perpetuate differences; and to prayer, because what we all alike need is that God should open our minds and hearts to *receive without prejudice the gradual revelation of His will as to the ways by which we are to be drawn together.*

"Being so far agreed, we are venturing, not we believe without the guidance of the Holy Spirit to approach, as far as we can, all the Christian ministers of religion in England to ask them to prepare their congregations for *a united effort of prayer on Whitsun Day next,* at the principal morning service, for the re-union of Christians—special care being taken that such prayer should be entirely uncontroversial and should involve no assumptions except those which all Christians can make their own, viz:—

"That our Lord meant us to be one in visible friendship; that our existing divisions hinder or even paralyse His work; and that we all deserve chastisement and need penitence, for the various ways in which we have contributed to produce or promote division; that we all need open and candid minds to receive light and yet more light, so that, in ways we perhaps as yet can hardly imagine, we may be led back towards unity.

"We believe that by these solemn exercises of penitential devotion dispositions may be created and nourished which will do much to end the needless embitterment so frequently pervading our differences of judgment and creed, and that a freer way may be prepared for the Divine purpose to realise itself."

(Open-Air) Evangelistic Service held every Sunday evening during the summer in front of our Town Hall was just such an effort, and deserved their warmer interest.

I added an invitation to communicants, ordinarily worshipping God in the various chapels in the neighbourhood, to join us at the *Lord's Table* at 8 a.m. on the chosen Sunday as all members of Christ's Church. It was impossible, I felt, to emphasize our sense of unity in Christ, and our longing for closer communion and fellowship with one another in Him, in any better way than that instituted by Himself for this very purpose. We who worship at the Mother Church are ourselves invited (I went on to say) to join a Corporate Christian *Prayer Meeting* at the Wesleyan Schools on the same day after Evening Service, when Church and Chapel Ministers will draw near to God together. It seemed to me that only by such practical efforts towards *Visible Fellowship* could we prove our "effort of prayer" sincere, and give such open tokens and proofs of mutual good-will as our Lord expects us to to give "that all men may know that we are His Disciples."

It was when writing to the Corinthians about their lack of visible fellowship, and beseeching them not to allow party-spirit to bring about "schism" or "breach of love" between members of Christ's Body, that St. Paul introduced (by way of an illustration) the very earliest account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which the Church possesses. Unless, he argued, they had the brotherly spirit of love, rich and poor together, it was not possible for them to *celebrate the Lord's Supper* in any true sense, for the essence thereof was to discern the Lord's Body, *i.e.*, their oneness in Him,—members of One Body just as they were sharers in One Loaf.

No one who was present at that United Communion Service at 8 a.m. and United Effort of Prayer at 8 p.m. on June 24th, 1906, is ever likely to forget it. With the numerous Ministers, Elders, Deacons, and other devout members from the various "folds" round about, we were about 200 strong at 8 a.m. and 300 at 8 p.m., meeting as sheep of One Flock led by One Shepherd.

If ever, since the first century, Christians having "*met with one accord in one place*" were thrilled by God's Spirit, "*filling all the place where they were assembled*"; if ever "*gladness and singleness of heart*" characterised a gathering both "*in the Breaking of Bread and in the Prayers,*" surely it was then. Many of the faces of those present seemed, to the clergy administering the sacrament, lit up with a heavenly radiance.

THE QUAKER POSITION.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

Probably not many Quakers see the *Modern Churchman*, so may one who is not a Quaker, protest against a statement in Mr. Gamble's paper in your October number ?

Mr. Gamble says: "The Quaker thought that he could regulate his conduct by the letter of the Gospel precepts." Mr. Graham, however, puts the Quaker position thus in his paper, "A Quaker Apologia," in the *Hibbert Journal* for October. "We believe that we and all men have, or may have, at the back of our personality, a Presence, a Spirit which is akin to or one with the Spirit which was at the back of the outward human personality of Jesus Christ. . . . Our supreme authority . . . habitually referred to for guidance in small things and great, obedience to whom brings peace to man, and dignity to his conduct, this Lord of life, we call the living Christ. His instructions are, in the spirit but not necessarily in the letter, like such instructions of the historic Jesus as have escaped the scattering years."

This seems to me not unlike Mr. Gamble's own position as set forth in his paper, "The New Testament in the Pulpit." Readers of Mr. Braithwaite's *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, will remember that even in the 17th century, when Anglicans and Puritans were still hurling texts at each other, George Fox and his followers desired to be led by the spirit of Christ rather than by the letter of the Gospels.

M.M.H.

THE ONE VOLUME BIBLE COMMENTARY.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

In your last issue two passages in the above-named work were severely criticised by the Rev. A. Fawkes, a writer whose contributions both to the *Quarterly Review* and to the *Modern Churchman* I much appreciate for their literary qualities, but who, I think, is, in general, more felicitous in his style than successful in his dealing with the complex aspects presented by the evolution of religion. One of the offending passages relates to the extermination of the Canaanites by Joshua, the other to the slaughter of the prophets of Baal by Elijah. I am only concerned with the second, which is a note on 1 Kings xviii., 40, to the effect that "The prophet probably was not himself their executioner, but made the people give practical evidence of the sincerity of their conversion." This is quoted as an example of the "spavined or knock-kneed type" of Apologetic, against which Mr. Fawkes protests. The suggestion as to Elijah's abstention from personally participating in the actual butcheries, and his motive for it, is, of course, purely conjectural, and hence I used the qualifying "probably," to which Mr. Fawkes appends the comment ("mark the doubt!") It still, however, seems to me plausible, for there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that Elijah wished to implicate his countrymen in his violent proceedings, in order to commit them to the religious reformation which he had in view, just as Jehu involved the rulers of Samaria in the bloodshed with which he effected his political revolution (2 Kings x. 6f). But be this as it may, the note was penned without any sinister apologetic purpose: when writing it, I was quite innocent of any desire to whitewash the prophet.

"ONE OF THE CONTRIBUTORS."

CURACY WANTED. Broad Churchman. Rochester diocese preferred. Apply E., c/o Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks.

WANTED A CURATE.—Apply to Rector, Chipping Barnet.